

Please accept my comments on Docket 04-233. Mine was one of the comments sent to you last year when media consolidation was in the public's consciousness. At that time my concern was that too many media outlets are controlled by a few owners of the media. If you hear the same theme from most of them, where is the diversity? If the public is subjected to opinions RATHER than actual news without the slant, where is the diversity? Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation, and is an abhorrent misuse of the public airwaves. When they control what I see and hear, they should have an obligation to assure that I get both sides.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. It's no secret that their primary interest is in selling advertising, and instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.